REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for this Examination.

Claims 1-3 and 5-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15 and 31 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over US Patent No. 7,188, 143 (Szeto) in view of US Patent Publication No. 2005/0102362 (Price et al.) and further in view of US Patent Publication No. 2002/0174010 (Rice, III).

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 1, as originally filed is allowable because it includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"determining a requested use attribute for instant message content generated by the source computer"

Claim 1 is allowable because in includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "determining a requested use attribute for instant message content generated by the source computer". As clearly provided in Applicant's specification, the use attribute is an attribute that controls use of the instant message content at a target computer from a source computer {0020 lines 6-15}. For example, the use attribute may include use settings at the target computer such as disallowing target computer functions that could compromise the security of instant message content. These functions might include screen capture, screen printing, IM application logging, IM printing, IM joining of a third party, etc. As will be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, these functions could be used to make a record of

11

instant message content without the knowledge or approval of the user at the source computer.

Szeto is directed to controlling the environment or appearance of instant messages through processing instant message user interface commands (such as the location where messages appear on a screen, playing a sound when a message is received, etc.) between the instant messaging client 212 and the conversation user interface 216 (see col. 6 lines 28-30 and col. 6 line 53 to col. 7 line 29). Szeto does not disclose or suggest determining a use attribute of instant message content. Nor does Szeto disclose or suggest controlling use of instant message content (the recipient's use of the content after the content is received) beyond the presentation of the content at the user interface.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeto, citing reference number (206). Reference number (206) is a cache with different user interface environments stored therein as described above. (at col. 3 line 1). Szeto defines an instant message environment as an initialization file and a file that defines how the environment looks and behaves (col. 9 lines 39-62). Thus, Szeto provides that the environment can request and retrieve an instruction set for the interface (i.e., appearance of the instant message window 204 – see col. 5 lines 9-12). The Examiner has erroneously equated a system that provides instructions for displaying instant messages on a computer screen with a system for controlling the use of the content of instant messages by the recipient.

Price is directed to a peripheral device using IM protocol to communicate events and/or status to a user computer. Price does not disclose or suggest determining a use attribute or in any way suggest controlling use of instant message content at a target computer.

Rice is directed to a thin client communication network for sharing files and does not disclose or suggest determining a use attribute for instant messaging or controlling the use of instant message content.

"sending the requested use attribute to the target computer"

Claim 1 is also allowable because in includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other reference cited, namely "sending the requested use attribute to the target computer". As explained above, the use attribute is not the same as an instant messaging environment.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeto at col. 13 line 53 "The control message is sent to IM client 202 which implements the requested IM application, ion step 1306." The Examiner has concluded in error that sending a control message is the same as sending a use attribute. However, the use attribute according to embodiments of Applicant's invention is the target computer's access or ability to use the instant message content beyond the conversation user interface (e.g, uses such as printing, saving, etc.). In sharp contrast, the instant messaging application in Szeto controls the display of the instant messages at the conversation user interface.

Szeto fails to disclose or suggest a use attribute, much less sending a use attribute to the target computer.

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

"receiving an indication verifying whether a content controlled instant message session is supported at the target computer"

Claim 1 is also allowable because in includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other reference cited, namely "receiving an indication verifying whether a content controlled instant message session is supported at the target computer". This feature allows the user of the source computer to verify that the target computer has the ability to control use of instant message content before sending instant messages containing confidential information. As clearly provided in the present specification this feature provides that the source computer receives an indication that the target computer has the mechanism (IMCC component 140B for example) to control the use of instant message content as required by the source computer for the content controlled session {0023}. Szeto does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication verifying whether a content controlled instant message session is supported at the target computer.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeto (at col. 8 line 65). The cited text addresses an environment sent to the target computer by the source (rather than being retrieved from a cache at target computer or downloaded from a

14

website). An authorization code or signature used to verify the integrity of the

environment means that the target computer can verify that the integrity of the

environment by checking the authorization code or signature. This does not suggest that

the target computer verifies content use controls and sends a message back to the source

so that the source computer can receive such an indication.

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has

failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

**"the content controlled instant message session controlling the use of content
provided over the session at the target computer in accordance with the session use
attribute"**

Claim 1 is also allowable because in includes another feature that is neither

disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "the content

controlled instant message session controlling the use of content provided over the

session at the target computer in accordance with the session use attribute". As clearly

provided in the specification {0040} the present invention provides for disabling features

such as printing, clip boarding, logging, etc. by issuing program function calls, for

example. This results in the operating system of the target computer not executing

operating system controlled commands.

The Examiner acknowledges that this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested

by Szeto.

The Examiner, however, has concluded in error that this feature is obvious in

view of Price and Rice. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Neither a peripheral

15

communicating with user using an instant messaging protocol nor a thin client network

disclose or suggest controlling the use of content of instant messages at a target

computer.

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has

failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 2 is allowable independently of claim 1, because it includes features that

are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either

individually or in combination.

**"the received indication further includes an indication that a use content feature on
the target computer corresponding to the requested use attribute has been
activated"**

Claim 2 is independently allowable because it includes another feature that is

neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "the

received indication further includes an indication that a use content feature on the target

computer corresponding to the requested use attribute has been activated". This feature

provides an indication that a specified use control has been activated at the target

computer. Szeto does not disclose or suggest either a use content feature (which controls

the use of features on the target computer such as printing, screen capture, etc) or

receiving an indication that such use content feature has been activated at the target

computer.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeta (at col. 1 line 40). However, the cited text provides that "the instant messaging client may display various means and buttons that activate common instant messaging functions such as changing font, ringing another user, inserting symbols, etc." Common instant messaging functions as provided in Szeto are display options. They do not control usage of the instant message content. Moreover, Szeto does not address providing an indication of activation of usage controls to the source computer.

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 3 is allowable independently of claims 1 and 2, because it includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"the controlled use of content feature is a disabled printing function, a disabled screen capture function, a disabled third party join function, a disabled clipboard copy function, or a disabled logging function at the target computer"

Claim 3 is independently allowable because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "the controlled use of content feature is a disabled printing function, a disabled screen capture

function, a disabled third party join function, a disabled clipboard copy function, or a

disabled logging function at the target computer." As clearly indicated in the Applicant's

specification, it is important to control these use of content features because these

features could compromise the security of instant message communications. Szeto does

not disclose or suggest controlling any of these use of content features.

The Examiner has concluded in error that control of these features is disclosed by

Szeto (at col. 13 line 56; col. 4 line 8; col. 12 line 36; Figs. 10; col. 1 line 32; col. 1 line

48; col. 5 line 46; and Figs. 1 and 3). However, the cited text comprise a user interface

window in which a computer monitor contains a history window for text message

content; the use of third party servers for instant messaging; the use of third party servers

for instant messaging; various instant message system block diagrams; an instant

messaging server performing functions to facilitate the transfer of messages; a message

server performing the functions of receiving messages and transferring them, replacing

certain text with symbols, or otherwise modifying or relaying messages; a definition of

user interface commands including functions, behaviors, actions, capabilities, etc. that are

features of the user interface or the instant messaging window; diagrams illustrating

instant messaging user interfaces ; (all of which are well known in the art and do not

suggest disabling any of the functions enumerated in claim 3 at the target computer).

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has

failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 5 is allowable independently of claim 1, because it includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"updating the session use attribute during communication over the content controlled instant message session after the establishing of the content controlled instant message session step"

Claim 5 is allowable independently of claim 1, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "updating the session use attribute during communication over the content controlled instant message session after the establishing of the content controlled instant message session step". This feature is important because it allows a user to change the controlled attributes during an instant message session, so that if, during the session the user decides to transmit sensitive content, the use attribute can be modified during the session to prevent compromising sensitive content. Szeto does not disclose or suggest changing use attributes during an instant message session.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeto (at col. 6 line 34 and col. 9 line 49). However, the cited text provides updating an environment before it is implemented (col. 6 lines 30-36) and accessing environment information without loading the environment (col. 9 lines 41-50). Both cited texts specifically

19

exclude changing an environment during a session (note that Applicants, as provided above, do not concede that an environment is equivalent to a content controlled session).

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claim 6 is allowable because it includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"receiving a first message containing a first requested use attribute from the source computer"

Claim 6 is allowable because it includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "receiving a first message containing a first requested use attribute from the source computer". This feature allows the target computer to respond to a request from the source computer to control a use attribute, to determine whether the target computer supports the use attribute. Szeto does not disclose or suggest receiving a requested use attribute from a source computer at a target computer.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeto at col. 13 line 53 and in Fig. 13. However, the cited paragraph refers to sending a control message to an IM client to implement an IM application. Applicants respectfully contend that an IM application control is not the same as a use attribute for the reasons previously presented under claim 1.

20

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

"sending a second message indicating the support of the content use feature to the source computer"

Claim 6 is also allowable because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "sending a second message indicating the support of the content use feature to the source computer". This feature allows the source computer to verify support of the content use feature prior to sending any IM content to prevent unwanted copying or distribution of privileged content.

The Examiner has concluded in error that this feature is disclosed by Szeto at col. 2 line 41. However the cited paragraph describes sending an IM environment identifier to an IM client, not a client sending confirmation of content use feature support. Support of a content use feature is different from an IM environment identifier. Moreover, Szeto does not communicate a target computer's support of a messaging environment, but rather loads the requested environment.

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claim 8 is allowable independently of claim 6, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"the controlled use of content feature is a disabled printing function, a disabled screen capture function, a disabled third party join function, a disabled clipboard copy function, or a disabled logging function at the target computer"

Claim 8 is also allowable because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "the controlled use of content feature is a disabled printing function, a disabled screen capture function, a disabled third party join function, a disabled clipboard copy function, or a disabled logging function at the target computer" as explained under claim 3.

Neither Price nor Rice provide what Szeto lacks. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facia case of obviousness.

Rejection of Claims 13 and 19 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 13 and 19 are allowable because they include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either individually or in combination. Each of the following features are presented under claim 1 and are allowable for the reasons presented under claim 1.

"determining a requested use attribute for instant message content generated by the source computer"

"sending the requested use attribute to the target computer"

"receiving an indication verifying whether a content controlled instant message session is supported at the target computer"

"establishing a content controlled instant message session having a session use attribute defining the content use feature"

Rejection of Claim 16 and 21 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 16 and 21 are allowable independently of claims 13 and 19, because they include another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"the content use feature is a printing function, a screen capture function, a third party join function, a clipboard copy function, or a logging function at the target computer"

Claim 16 is allowable independently of claim 13, because it includes another

feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited,

namely "the content use feature is a printing function, a screen capture function, a third

party join function, a clipboard copy function, or a logging function at the target

computer" as presented under claim 3.

Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claim 20 is allowable independently of claim 19, because it includes another
feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other
references, either individually or in combination.

"the indication further includes an indication that a use content feature on the target computer corresponding to the requested use attribute has been activated"

Claim 20 is allowable independently of claim 19, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other reference cited, namely "the indication further includes an indication that a use content feature on the target computer corresponding to the requested use attribute has been activated" as explained under claim 2.

Rejection of Claim 23 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claim 23 is allowable independently of claim 19, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"updating the session use attribute during communication over the content controlled instant message session after the establishing of the content controlled instant message session step"

Claim 20 is allowable independently of claim 19, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other reference cited, namely "updating the session use attribute during communication over the content controlled instant message session after the establishing of the content controlled instant message session" as explained under claim 5.

Rejection of Claim 24 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claim 24 is allowable because it includes the following features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either individually or in combination for the reasons presented under claim 6.

"receiving a first message containing a first requested use attribute from the source computer"

"sending a second message indicating the support of the content use feature to the source computer"

Rejection of Claim 26 under 35 USC 103 over Szeto in view of Price and Rice

Claims 26 is allowable independently of claim 24, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto, Price, Rice, or any other references, either individually or in combination.

"the content use feature is a disabled printing function, a disabled screen capture function, a disabled third party join function, a disabled clipboard copy function, or a disabled logging function at the target computer"

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 26 is allowable independently of claim 24, because it includes another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Szeto or any other reference cited, namely "the content use feature is a disabled printing function, a disabled screen capture function, a disabled third party join function, a disabled clipboard copy function, or a disabled logging function at the target computer" as explained under claim 3.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1-3 and 5-31 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-31 and issuance of letters patent.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven E. Bach
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,530